

## REMARKS

### A. The Advisory Office Action and the Phone Interview

In the Advisory Office Action, the examiner indicates Applicant's previous response has overcome the following rejections:

- 1) The rejection of claims 1, 3, 4, 5, and 22 under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph (item 4 of the Final Office action of August 28, 2006).
- 2) The rejection of claim 30 under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph (item 6 of the Final Office action of August 28, 2006).
- 3) The rejections of claims 1, 3, 4, and 22. under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) (item 10 of the Final Office action of August 28, 2006).
- 4) The rejection of claim 5 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) (item 11 of the Final Office action of August 28, 2006). The rejection of claims 6, 8-13, and 24 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) (item 12 of the Final Office action of August 28, 2006). and
- 5) The rejection of claims 15-17 and 25 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) (item 13 of the Final Office action of August 28, 2006).

The Examiner maintained the rejection of claims 1,3,4,5,6,8-13,15,17,22,23,24,and 25 under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph (item 5 of the Final Office action of August 28, 2006) because the Applicant has not provided support for "neutral", polymer. The Examiner also maintained the rejections of claim 26 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) (item 14 of the Final Office action of August 28, 2006) and the rejection of claim 30 under 55 U.S.C. 103(a) (item 15 of the Final Office action of August 28, 2006), in view of Fuhr. The Examiner also pointed out that Applicant has also not cancelled withdrawn claims 18-21.

The Applicant appreciate that the Examiner has extended a phone interview on the Advisory Office Action on November 21, 2006. Based on the advice in the Advisory Office Action and the suggestions discussed over the phone interview, the Applicant has amended the claims as follows.

B. Claim Amendments

To address the 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph rejection on claims 1,3,4,5,6,8-13,15,17,22,23,24,and 25, the Applicant has amended claims 1, 6, 10, and 15 to remove the word "neutral" previously added in the response of June 19, 2006.

In face of the rejections of claims 26 and 30 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a), the Applicant has cancelled claims 26 and 30.

Claims 18-21 have also been cancelled.

There is no new matter added in these amendments.

The Applicant believes that the above amendment has remedied the deficiencies of the claims and put them into the condition of allowance.

Base on the examiner's indication, the Applicant attaches the Pefferkom and Horkay articles cited on page 16 of the response of October 30, 2006. Also attached is, the Declaration of Dr. Armstrong discussed on pages 21-22 of the same response.

#### C. Conclusion

In view of the foregoing, it is respectfully submitted that the application is in condition for allowance and such action is respectfully requested. Should any extensions of time or fees be necessary in order to maintain this Application in pending

condition, appropriate requests are hereby made and  
authorization is given to debit Account # 02-2275.

Respectfully submitted,

LUCAS & MERCANTI, LLP

By: Donald C. Lucas  
Donald C. Lucas, 31,275  
Attorney for Applicant(s)  
475 Park Avenue South, 15<sup>th</sup> Floor  
New York, NY 10016  
Tel. # 212-661-8000

DCL/YC

Encls: